

Date: Wed, 19 May 93 16:36:32 PDT
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu
Precedence: Bulk
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V93 #155
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest Wed, 19 May 93 Volume 93 : Issue 155

Today's Topics:

 11m vs Hams (was No-Code Stupidity) (2 msgs)
 Data Points
 High speed Morse code requirement (2 msgs)
 Morse et cetera...
 No Code Debate (2 msgs)
 Put up or Shut up!
 Type certification

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>

Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>

Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: 19 May 1993 16:07:08 GMT
From: dog.ee.lbl.gov!overload.lbl.gov!agate!howland.reston.ans.net!
zaphod.mps.ohio-state.edu!cs.utexas.edu!asuvax!chnews!news@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: 11m vs Hams (was No-Code Stupidity)
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <1993May18.234847.9471@oz.plymouth.edu>
 r_fussel@oz.plymouth.edu (Ronald D. Fussell) writes:

 [Massive, Bandwidth-conserving Deletium at this exact spot]

> This thread has taken a turn so I will resstate my original
>argument. 11 meters is less mature, ruder, and overall less
>professional than the rest of HF.

But you do meet such *interesting* women there! ;-)

Jim, W5GYJ

Date: Wed, 19 May 1993 13:44:43 GMT
From: usc!howland.reston.ans.net!gatech!wa4mei!ke4zv!gary@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: 11m vs Hams (was No-Code Stupidity)
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <DRXR4B3w165w@amanda.jpunix.com> robert@amanda.jpunix.com (robert) writes:

>> >obnoxious behaviors that certain Morsely impaired individuals in the
>
>Morsely impaired individuals? That's a new one on me. Hey Todd, perhaps
>you can use that as a disability, and request a handicap waiver from the
>code elements. Just think...you could sail all the way to Extra, with
>hardly any effort on your part at all!

I guess you don't read 73. Wayne claims high speed Morse causes brain damage, thus Morsely impaired refers to high speed Morse addicts.

Gary

--
Gary Coffman KE4ZV | You make it, | gatech!wa4mei!ke4zv!gary
Destructive Testing Systems | we break it. | uunet!rsiatl!ke4zv!gary
534 Shannon Way | Guaranteed! | emory!kd4nc!ke4zv!gary
Lawrenceville, GA 30244 | |

Date: Wed, 19 May 93 19:08:52 GMT
From: usc!howland.reston.ans.net!usenet.ins.cwru.edu!agate!headwall.Stanford.EDU!
nntp.Stanford.EDU!umunhum!paulf@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: Data Points
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

HF Spectrum Survey for Amateur Service

Equipment:

W6YX (6 element monoband beam, pointed over major US population centers,
Icom IC-761 transceiver) CM87WK

#	Band	Date	Time	CW	DATA	SSB
1	20	5/15/93	0120UT	29	12	30
2	20	5/16/93	2010UT	30	15	25

--

-=Paul Flaherty, N9FZX | "The National Anthem has become The Whine."
->paulf@Stanford.EDU | -- Charles Sykes, _A Nation of Victims_

Date: Wed, 19 May 93 18:56:49 GMT
From: usc!howland.reston.ans.net!agate!headwall.Stanford.EDU!nntp.Stanford.EDU!
umunhum!paulf@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: High speed Morse code requirement
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <VBREault.93May18175328@rinhp750.gmr.com> vbreault@rinhp750.gmr.com
(Val Breault) writes:

>I will mention "Morse code" and "high speed Morse code".
>Please note that they are intentionally different.

I personally think that the 20 wpm exam is also somewhat silly, given the
reductions in service use. If we're looking for ways to compress the number
of licenses, the 5 and 13 exams should do just fine. It would also be nice
if Part 97 was a bit more specific in terms of what constitutes copying CW
at a certain rate.

--

-=Paul Flaherty, N9FZX | "The National Anthem has become The Whine."
->paulf@Stanford.EDU | -- Charles Sykes, _A Nation of Victims_

Date: Wed, 19 May 1993 21:50:24 GMT
From: usc!howland.reston.ans.net!agate!news.ucdavis.edu!othello.ucdavis.edu!
ez006683@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: High speed Morse code requirement
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

paulf@umunhum.stanford.edu (Paul Flaherty) writes:

: I personally think that the 20 wpm exam is also somewhat silly, given the
: reductions in service use. If we're looking for ways to compress the number
: of licenses, the 5 and 13 exams should do just fine. It would also be nice
: if Part 97 was a bit more specific in terms of what constitutes copying CW
: at a certain rate.

What would you suggest? It seems that one minute without any missed
figures or 70% on a 10 question multi-guess test is not bad, not great, but
not bad.

Dan

--

```
*-----*
* Daniel D. Todd      Packet: KC6UUD@WA6RDH.#nocal.ca.usa      *
*                      Internet: DDTODD@ucdavis.edu             *
*                      Snail Mail: 1750 Hanover #102            *
*                      Davis CA 95616                          *
*-----*
*      I do not speak for the University of California....    *
*      and it sure as hell doesn't speak for me!!             *
*-----*
```

Date: 19 May 93 17:49:15 GMT
From: microsoft!wingnut!laurahal@uunet.uu.net
Subject: Morse et cetera...
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

(much flamage deleted)

Let me make sure I've got this right: this heated, merciless, knock-'em-down-drag-'em-out flame war is over the level of Morse Code competence that should be required to get a ham license?

This is a *hobby*, folks. It isn't (usually) life and death. The code requirement isn't the work of the FCC or DOC; it's an ITU regulation. I favor a no-code entry to amateur radio, but encourage folks to study code, and respect those who do - especially if they do it well. I approach ham radio as an opportunity to mess with electronics, learn about radio communication, chat with folks and have fun. If people want to spend their days yakking on repeaters - I know a couple of hams who do - that's fine too. If people want to buy all their gear and never worry about what's inside it, fine, though those who view ham radio as a contest to see who can spend the most money on the most high-tech toys rub me the wrong way. I'm interested in rolling my own. But that's me. Your mileage may vary.

Newer modes rival CW's spectral efficiency and ability to punch through noise, but none of them can match the simplicity and elegance of a CW transmitter or receiver.

And since some people feel that your license class matters in this argument, For the Record: I got my license about 6 weeks ago, after being an SWL forever. My license is a Canadian basic certificate, but I am hitting the books - hard - for both my Advanced certificate and 12 WPM Morse. This will put me in between a U.S. General and Advanced.

BTW: I'm using various sources for practicing code, including W1AW, SuperMorse and 73's tapes. I noticed the other day that the 6+ WPM tape seemed an awful lot faster than the 5 WPM learning code tape (I needed to fill out a few letters in the alphabet), and I was filling reams of paper with copy. So I compared it to SuperMorse, and fed the audio to HamComm (of course I built the interface myself). The result: my '6+ WPM' tape is actually 20 WPM. I'm copying 90% of it. 12 WPM plain language should be a breeze... :-)

73 from Vancouver.

...laura, VE7LDH

Date: Wed, 19 May 1993 17:05:43 GMT
From: usc!howland.reston.ans.net!europa.eng.gtefsd.com!eddie.mit.edu!news.kei.com!ddsw1!chinet!megabyte@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: No Code Debate
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

kd1hz@anomaly.sbs.com (Rev. Michael P. Deignan) writes:
>r_fussell@oz.plymouth.edu (Ronald D. Fussell) writes:
>> NOW this guy has a good attitude about the whole thing. Too bad
>>the other no-code techs don't take after this gentleman's example
>Ditto. Clearly another fine amateur in the makings.

Hmm... I was a tech. Then, 3 months later, I upgraded to tech+ by passing the 5wpm code test. I am working on the 13wpm for my general. I will get it. Then I plan on using SSB, RTTY, PACTOR, and SSTV. While I have no objection to the 13WPM requirement, I have to agree that I don't see how it will make me a better operator, or how it will better prpeare me for the HF operations I intend to do.

I neither support nor attack the higher code speed requirements. I accept them as what I mst do in order to operate the modes and bands I wish to use. I do often wonder _why_ though.

--

"It is a pity that even a single drop of this noble
gift of God should be spilled" - J.S. Bach on wine
Mark E. Sunderlin: Technocrat in Winchester, VA KD4HRI
aka Dr. Megabyte: megabyte@chinet.chinet.com (703) 722-9330

Date: Wed, 19 May 93 18:35:36 GMT
From: usc!howland.reston.ans.net!agate!headwall.Stanford.EDU!nntp.Stanford.EDU!

umunhum!paulf@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: No Code Debate
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <1993May19.065957.16039@ke4zv.uucp> gary@ke4zv.UUCP (Gary Coffman) writes:

>There are three schools of thought among the proponents of continued
>irrelevant manual Morse encoding testing.

None of the arguments I've put forth fall into those three schools. I take it therefore that those arguments don't fall under the umbrella of "proponents of irrelevant manual Morse encoding"?

--

--Paul Flaherty, N9FZX | "The National Anthem has become The Whine."
->paulf@Stanford.EDU | -- Charles Sykes, _A Nation of Victims_

Date: Thu, 20 May 1993 00:47:24 GMT
From: pa.dec.com!nnTPd2.cxo.dec.com!nuts2u.enet.dec.com!little@decwrl.dec.com
Subject: Put up or Shut up!
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Well as I passed along to someone recently in an email message, why not first of all eliminate multiple choice written exams? I may be wrong on this, but I suspect that vast majority of VEs use or have access to PCs for test giving. At least in this area they almost all give elements 1A - 1C on a PC using SuperMorse. If that is the case, then why not use SuperMorse as an example and build a PC based test generator that generates fill-in-the-blank style tests and answer keys for the VE. SuperMorse already does this for Morse tests, i.e. has a template for a QSO and fills in actual values at QSO creation time. Certainly templates could be used for the written questions too. This would eliminate rote memorization of the written exam. If fill-in-the-blank style exams are too difficult for the VEs to grade, then fall back to multiple choice, but based upon templates and not fixed questions.

The next thing I'd like to see is consolidating elements 1A - 1C with the written elements as proposed by Gary Coffman. Along with this, an increasing emphasis on the digital modes.

73,
Todd
N9MWB

Date: Wed, 19 May 1993 07:13:16 GMT
From: nwnexus!ole!ssc!markz@uunet.uu.net
Subject: Type certification
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Daniel D. Todd (ez006683@othello.ucdavis.edu) wrote:

: I'm interested in the requirements for type certification. I know that
: manufactured transmitters need to be type certified and that I can build
: my own transcievers with no worry. (except getting it to work) What about
: kits? If someone sells parts kits and boards do they need to be
: certified? What if they sell all the boards with components soldered on
: and only the insertion of a CPU and mounting of tubes is required to get
: on the air? Aside from transmitters what needs type certification.

It's complicated and covered in Title 47 Code of Federal Regulations
Part 2. And whatever section that covers the service the equipment
operates under. For general consumer equipment operating without
a license, Part 15 applies.

Kits are discussed in Part 15. And even a partial collection of
parts is considered a kit. But you look at the paragraph on
kits (15.25) and all it talks about are TV Interface Devices
(ie. devices that produce a RF Video signal). Kind of confused.
There are exclusions for limited quantities of home built equipment.

For ham service, fancy manufactured rigs have to be Certified
under Part 15, the rfi regulations, like any digital device. Just like
computers and all that other stuff. But I don't think any other
approval is required, except for linear amplifiers which have to be
Type Accepted.

The approval is a real zoo. Verified, Notified, Certified,
Type Accepted, and Type Approved and I may have left one or two out.

Verified means (as I read it) that you have run it through a lab and
it met the regs, but you don't have to tell the FCC about it. But if
there's a problem and they knock on your door, you better have a lab
report in your files. (Mostly for broadcast receivers and the like.)

Notified means that you've run it through a lab and have to tell the
FCC that the device exists. (Various receivers.)

Certified means that you've run it through a lab and are filing the
results and design with the FCC, who then issues you a valid ID number.
Without which, you cannot distribute the equipment.
(Computers, Scanners, Phone equipment.)

Type Accepted means that the FCC has to approve of the design.

(Most transmitters.)

Type Approved means that you have to ship them one so they can check it out. (Broadcast Transmitters.)

Disclaimer: I'm not a lawyer. Reading FCC regulations sure beats counting sheep if you want fall asleep.

Mark Zenier markz@ssc.wa.com markz@ssc.com

Date: Wed, 19 May 93 18:02:08 GMT
From: dog.ee.lbl.gov!overload.lbl.gov!agate!headwall.Stanford.EDU!
nntp.Stanford.EDU!umunhum!paulf@network.UCSD.EDU
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1993May13.081003.20215@ke4zv.uucp>,
<1993May14.233610.329@leland.Stanford.EDU>, <1993May19.061012.15745@ke4zv.uucp>
Subject : Re: More on no-code

In article <1993May19.061012.15745@ke4zv.uucp> gary@ke4zv.UUCP (Gary Coffman) writes:

>What it "sounds like" is a static crash, a heterodyne, or a fade into the
>mud.

The amplitude of a static crash is seldom uniformly greater than signal; however, the event time is indeed usually several bits. Thus the effect is multiple garbled characters. However, given context, you can pull some of the bits out -- but only if you're not throwing that information away. Heterodynes aren't usually a problem with CW, given 1) the 5x narrower bandwidth, and 2) the human ability to discriminate tone. The same can't be said for most pll or dpll modem implementations. Rayleigh fades on HF have an event time that is less than 50ms (95% confidence), and given the long symbol times of CW, are rarely a problem. As long as the symbol rate doesn't exceed 200 baud, it shouldn't be a problem for a well designed modem either.

>If you'd bothered to read beyond the first sentence you quote, you'd know
>that I was talking about interrupted spreading sequences that don't put
>energy outside the amateur bands.

Hmm, well, still, you only have access to those bands between the LUF and MUF. That's not nearly as much spread bandwidth as you have available at UHF.

>As to differing propagation, that's one of the advantages of HF. It
>practically guarantees that *some* of the energy, on some band, will always
>reach the destination.

While this is true, it doesn't address the problem I'd indicated. With the variance in the F1/F2 layer height, the path length changes dramatically. Unless you have some apriori knowledge of those changes, you can't correlate them out. You also haven't explained how you're going to make lots of cheap, stable clocks; again, if it was easy, GPS would be cheap. In general, you haven't addressed the problem of synchronization.

While SS addresses fading and interference, it doesn't address signal strength, unless you plan to be all alone on the band. You also haven't dealt with the code allocation, or CQ problems.

>We already have, DSP systems are available for as little as \$199 today,
>and prices continue to drop.

The actual hardware cost is about \$30. Given a 100% profit margin, that means that 70% of the cost is in the software. Application software prices are going up, not down.

>Getting the *people* to do it *is* a problem, and is the problem being
>addressed by the proposed licensing changes. By attracting more people who
>are not brain washed by narrow thinking, it's possible we will get the
>programming done.

I'm sorry, but you have not demonstrated that the people who already have full access to HF aren't capable of doing what you say. I'm the author of a freeware Reed - Solomon coder (GNU ECC), and I don't think I've been "brainwashed" by anybody.

--

--Paul Flaherty, N9FZX | "The National Anthem has become The Whine."
->paulf@Stanford.EDU | -- Charles Sykes, _A Nation of Victims_

Date: Wed, 19 May 93 18:53:07 GMT
From: usc!howland.reston.ans.net!agate!headwall.Stanford.EDU!nntp.Stanford.EDU!
umunhum!paulf@network.UCSD.EDU
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1993May18.171220.5822@oz.plymouth.edu>,
<DRXR4B3w165w@amanda.jpunix.com>, <1993May19.134443.19291@ke4zv.uucp>
Subject : Re: 11m vs Hams (was No-Code Stupidity)

In article <1993May19.134443.19291@ke4zv.uucp> gary@ke4zv.UUCP (Gary Coffman) writes:

>I guess you don't read 73. Wayne claims high speed Morse causes brain
>damage, thus Morsely impaired refers to high speed Morse addicts.

Of course, there are those who would claim that as a former vice presidential

candidate (and convicted tax evader), Wayne has a few mistuned IFs...;-)

--

-=Paul Flaherty, N9FZX | "The National Anthem has become The Whine."
->paulf@Stanford.EDU | -- Charles Sykes, _A Nation of Victims_

Date: Wed, 19 May 93 18:45:35 GMT
From: usc!howland.reston.ans.net!agate!headwall.Stanford.EDU!nntp.Stanford.EDU!
umunhum!paulf@network.UCSD.EDU
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1993May17.141704.9374@ke4zv.uucp>,
<1993May17.174451.20242@leland.Stanford.EDU>, <1993May19.074459.16472@ke4zv.uucp>
Subject : Re: More on no-code

In article <1993May19.074459.16472@ke4zv.uucp> gary@ke4zv.UUCP (Gary Coffman)
writes:

>As for experimental licenses, I held one. It's a useful license for some
>things, but for techniques that require widespread testing, it's less
>than ideal. The amateur license is *also* an experimental license, and
>offers a much wider testing ground.

So, how's the work on the cheap, public domain HF spread spectrum system
coming?

It's all nice and fine to advocate a system, but let's face it, it doesn't
now exist, and nobody's working on it. I'd say that's because it's
technically infeasible for the desired end user cost; there are plenty of
similar examples which are analogous.

But above all, unless you're willing to put in the free labor yourself, you're
just offending those of us who already have.

--

-=Paul Flaherty, N9FZX | "The National Anthem has become The Whine."
->paulf@Stanford.EDU | -- Charles Sykes, _A Nation of Victims_

Date: Wed, 19 May 93 17:21:25 GMT
From: usc!howland.reston.ans.net!agate!headwall.Stanford.EDU!nntp.Stanford.EDU!
umunhum!paulf@network.UCSD.EDU
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1993May16.181124.107689@locus.com>,
<1993May17.165536.17953@leland.Stanford.EDU>, <1993May18.232832.143906@locus.com>

Subject : Re: More on no-code

In article <1993May18.232832.143906@locus.com> dana@lando.la.locus.com (Dana H. Myers) writes:

>True, but I *thought* this discussion had to do with licensing
>procedures and the goals of the FCC for the Amateur Radio Service.

Yes, and the laws which govern FCC actions with respect to the Amateur Service are contained in both CA'34 et al, as well as in 47 CFR 97.

--

-=Paul Flaherty, N9FZX | "The National Anthem has become The Whine."
->paulf@Stanford.EDU | -- Charles Sykes, _A Nation of Victims_

Date: Wed, 19 May 93 19:03:15 GMT
From: dog.ee.lbl.gov!overload.lbl.gov!agate!headwall.Stanford.EDU!
nnntp.Stanford.EDU!umunhum!paulf@network.UCSD.EDU
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <C76uF0.70@ucdavis.edu>, <1993May18.161633.28800@leland.Stanford.EDU>,
<1993May19.075511.16555@ke4zv.uucp>paulf
Subject : Re: More on no-code

In article <1993May19.075511.16555@ke4zv.uucp> gary@ke4zv.UUCP (Gary Coffman) writes:

>Most hams do have a finite amount of time to spend on the air. Therefore
>the mode that conveys the most information in the least time is the most
>useful to them.

Using that as a premise, we quickly come to the conclusion that nobody should use anything other than voice. So, you've now doubled (or even tripled) the number of ops on HF, and they should all use SSB. You've just proven my point again.

--

-=Paul Flaherty, N9FZX | "The National Anthem has become The Whine."
->paulf@Stanford.EDU | -- Charles Sykes, _A Nation of Victims_

Date: Wed, 19 May 1993 12:44:15 GMT
From: dog.ee.lbl.gov!overload.lbl.gov!agate!howland.reston.ans.net!
darwin.sura.net!rsg1.er.usgs.gov!resdgs1.er.usgs.gov!tbodoh@network.UCSD.EDU
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1993May18.131251.13893@rsg1.er.usgs.gov>,

<JeBR4B1w165w@amanda.jpunix.com>, <1993May19.000047.18501@anomaly.sbs.com>gs1
Subject : Re: No-Code Stupidity

In article <1993May19.000047.18501@anomaly.sbs.com>, kd1hz@anomaly.sbs.com (Rev. Michael P. Deignan) writes:

```
|>
|> Welp, Robert, you can thank the United States Welfare-State Mentality.
|> It's finally creeping into Amateur Radio.
|>
|> #define NASAL_WHINE ON
|>
|> "waaaaaaaaaaaa! Why should I have to know code to use HF? Its an outdated mode
|> anyway! waaaaaaaaaaaa!"
|>
|> #define NASAL_WHINE OFF
|>
|> I'm sure you're familiar with that state of mind. Bitch, moan, and complain
|> about something long enough and eventually someone will give it to you just to
|> get you to shut the hell up.
|>
|>
|> MD
|> --
|> -- Michael P. Deignan, KD1HZ / Since I *OWN* SBS.COM,
```

--

And MOST of us in this group are tired of your pro-code whining. Discussion and debate are welcome but your diatribes are ridiculous attempts at conveying your belief that code gives you some kind of mystical insight to hamdom that cannot possibly be experienced without code. I CHALLENGE you to discuss this in a non-insulting and non-obscene manner, but I doubt that you're capable. You seem to think that obscenity and insults will somehow persuade people - or perhaps you just like to hear yourself whine.

Don't even bother flaming.

```
+++++
+ Tom Bodoh - Sr. systems software engineer
+
+ USGS/EROS Data Center, Sioux Falls, SD, USA 57198 (605) 594-6830 +
+ Internet; bodoh@dgg.cr.usgs.gov (152.61.192.66)
+
+ "Welcome back my friends to the show that never ends!" EL&P
+
+++++
```

End of Ham-Policy Digest V93 #155
